

In contrast, claim 1 recites a completely different method for reinforcing an excavation face that comprises a reinforcement step comprising making of a plurality of holes 5 in a vertical or vertically inclined configuration in which a reinforcement structure 6-7 is inserted.

As it is clearly set forth in the description (see page 8, lines 16 to the end and pages 9-13, and, in addition, page 13 lines 6 to the end and the following pages) and also claims 23 and the following claims, the reinforcement step of claim 1 is a distinct and specific step that is performable in addition of a soil consolidation step and in particular at excavation faces.

None of the cited prior documents regards or mentions such a method and/or an excavation face reinforcement step as claimed in claim 1.

The technical problem underlying the invention is that of the efficient, simple and safe face excavation reinforcement in an urban area.

None of the cited prior art documents mentions or regards such a technical problem.

Therefore it is believed that the cited prior art documents, either if taken alone or in combination cannot render obvious the subject-matter of claim 1.

Accordingly, the application is now believed to meet the requirements of the Treaty.

It is respectfully solicited that the submitted amendments and arguments are taken into account.

The applicant is hopeful that a favorable International Preliminary Examination Report will be established.

If further clarifications are deemed necessary by the Examiner, the applicant is willing to discuss the matter during an informal interview, under Rule 66.6.

Respectfully submitted,

S. Lara MODIANO

Professional Representative for the Applicant



Enclosures: Claims pages 29-39;  
Description pages 6 and 6a.